



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
087807,567	02/28/97	PETROLY R	277301

MICHAEL R. FRISCIA  
FRISCIA & NUSSBAUM  
405 MURRAY HILL PARKWAY  
EAST RUTHERFORD NJ 07073

LM02/0617

EXAMINER

PATEL, R

ART UNIT

2786

PAPER NUMBER

5

DATE MAILED: 06/17/98

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
**08/807,567**

Applicant(s)  
**Petrocy et al.**

Examiner  
**Ramesh Patel**

Group Art Unit  
**2786**



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 28, 1997

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been  
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2786

---

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-6 are presented for examination.
2. Applicant has not cited any prior art in a field where substantial prior art exists. Applicant is reminded of his duty to disclose prior art of which he is aware as per 37 CFR 197 and 198.
3. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

**Specification**

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains two paragraphs and contains more than 250 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
5. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 250 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 250 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

Art Unit: 2786

---

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

*Claim Objections*

6. Claims 4-5 are objected to because of the following informalities:

(a) claim 4, line 10, has a "," at the end of the claim; claim should end with a period which is end of the claim.

(b) claim 5, line 1, contains the term "The apparatus" should be "The system" because independent claim 3, uses the term the system.

Appropriate correction is required.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lesko et al. in view of Simson et al.

Lesko teaches the invention (claims 1, 4 and 6) as claimed including a system for self-addressing one or more control units comprising: controller means (e.g., see figures 7-10 and

Art Unit: 2786

---

col. 4, lines 3-68); one or more control units (e.g., see figures 7-10); electrical communication means extending between the controller means and the one or more control units (e.g., see col. 2, line 56 to col. 4, line 48); signal means for requesting the control units to identify themselves (e.g., see col. 2, line 56 to col. 4, line 48); sending a system start-up signal from the controller means to the plurality of control units (e.g., see col. 2, line 56 to col. 4, line 48); sequentially self-addressing the plurality of control units by having a controlled unit look at the address of a pervious control unit of the plurality of control units, add a one to the address, and store the address in memory (e.g., see figures 7-10 and col. 2, line 56 to col. 4, line 48); but Lesko fails to teach means for each control unit to separately identify itself by receiving a number input from the a previous control unit and adding a one thereto.

Simson teaches means for each control unit to separately identify itself by receiving a number input from the a previous control unit and adding a one thereto (e.g., see figures 2-9 and col. 5, line 5 to col. 7, line 48). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the was made to modify the teachings of Lesko with the teaching of Simson because this modification would provide Lesko's teaching with the capability of providing a control method which can shorten the time for the development of a tuning rule and tunes a control parameter without being limited by the type of time response of an input/output variable for a combined controlling controlled system and thereby improves the controllability and provides a system suitable for use in the practice of the control method.

Art Unit: 2786

---

As to claim 2, Lesko teaches the system wherein each control unit means includes a non-volatile memory in which it stores its identification number (e.g., see figures 7-10 and col. 4, line 3 to col. 5, line 17).

As to claim 3, Lesko teaches system wherein each control unit has a feedback line to another control unit (e.g., see figures 7-10).

As to claim 5, Lesko teaches the system wherein the control units look to the broadcast wire for an ID number and read a block of data that follows its IDS number (e.g., see col. 4, line 3 to col. 5, line 17).

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2786

---

9. Any inquiry concerning this or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Ramesh Patel at (703) 308-6673.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Reba I. Elmore, can be reached on (703)305-9706.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

rp *R Patel*  
Art Unit-2786  
June 5, 1998

*Paul P. Gordon*  
PAUL P. GORDON  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit: 2786

---

\*\*\*\*\*

## IMPORTANT NOTICE

\*\*\*\*\*

Effective November 16, 1997, the Examiner handling this application will be assigned to a new Art Unit as a result of the consolidation into Technology Center 2700. See the forth coming Official Gazette notice dated November 11, 1997. For any written or facsimile communication submitted **ON OR AFTER** November 16, 1997, this Examiner, who was assigned to Art Unit 2306, will be assigned to Art Unit 2786. Please include the new Art Unit in the caption or heading of any communication submitted after the November 16, 1997 date. Your cooperation in this matter will assist in the timely processing of the submission and is appreciated by the Office.